

REMARKS

Claims 22, 23, 25, 49, 50, 52, 56 and 58-62 are currently pending in this application. Claims 22, 23, 25, 49 and 62 have been amended, and claims 24, 51 and 57 have been canceled without prejudice in this response.

In the Office Action dated July 28, 2006, claims 22-25, 49-52 and 56-62 were rejected. More specifically, the status of the application in light of this Office Action is as follows:

- (A) Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Korean Patent Application No. 1997-0008549 to Kye et al. ("Kye");
- (B) Claims 23 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kye;
- (C) Claims 49, 50, 52, 56 and 58-61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Kye and U.S. Patent No. 6,413,150 to Blair ("Blair");
- (D) Claims 24 and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Kye and Japanese Patent No. 01-067346 to Tsuchiko et al. ("Tsuchiko"); and
- (E) Claims 51 and 62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Kye, Blair and Tsuchiko.

A. Response to the Section 102(b) Rejection over Kye

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kye. As described below, Kye fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of this claim.

1. Claim 22 is Directed to a Method for Finishing a Surface of a Protective Package on a Microelectronic Device Including, *inter alia*, Marking the Marking Surface After Cleaning Residual Materials and/or Chemicals From the Package

Claim 22 is directed to a method for finishing a surface of a protective package on a microelectronic device. The method includes chemically etching at least a portion of the surface of the package to remove a layer of material from the package and form a marking surface, and cleaning residual materials and/or chemicals from the package after terminating the etching of

the package surface. The method further includes marking the marking surface after cleaning residual materials and/or chemicals from the package.

2. Kye Discloses a Method for Removing Marks from a Semiconductor Chip Package

Kye discloses a method for removing marks from a semiconductor chip package. The method includes placing a chip package in a removal device, removing the markings on the marked face of the package with a chemical removal agent, and rinsing the face of the package to eliminate the residue from the marking removal process. (Kye, claims 5 and 8.)

3. Kye Fails to Disclose or Suggest a Method for Finishing a Surface of a Protective Package on a Microelectronic Device Including, *inter alia*, Marking the Marking Surface After Cleaning Residual Materials and/or Chemicals From the Package

Kye fails to disclose or suggest a method for finishing a surface of a protective package on a microelectronic device including, *inter alia*, "marking the marking surface after cleaning residual materials and/or chemicals from the package," as recited in claim 22. Kye only discloses a mark removal process for a chip package. Moreover, one skilled in the art would not modify Kye's method to mark the package surface after cleaning, because such a modification would frustrate one purpose of Kye's invention, which is to remove the mark from the chip package. Accordingly, the Section 102(b) rejection of claim 22 should be withdrawn because Kye fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of the claim.

B. Response to the Section 103(a) Rejection over Kye

Claims 23 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kye. Independent claims 23 and 25 have, *inter alia*, features generally analogous to the features of claim 22. Accordingly, the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 23 and 25 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 22 and for the additional features of these claims.

C. Response to the Section 103(a) Rejection over Kye and Blair

Claims 49, 50, 52, 56 and 58-61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Kye and Blair. Independent claims 49, 56 and 60 have, *inter alia*, features

generally analogous to the features of claim 22. Accordingly, claims 49, 56 and 60 are patentable over Kye for at least the reasons discussed above and for the additional features of these claims. Moreover, Blair fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Kye to properly support a Section 103(a) rejection of claims 49, 56 and 60. For example, Blair fails to provide a reason for modifying Kye's method to mark the package surface after cleaning. Therefore, the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 49, 56 and 60 should be withdrawn.

Claims 50 and 52 depend from claim 49; claims 58 and 59 depend from claim 56; and claim 61 depends from claim 60. Accordingly, the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 50, 52, 58, 59 and 61 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to their respective independent claims and for the additional features of these claims.

D. Response to the Section 103(a) Rejection over Kye and Tsuchiko

Claims 24 and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kye and Tsuchiko. Claims 24 and 57 have been canceled in this response and therefore the rejection of claims 24 and 57 is now moot.

E. Response to the Section 103(a) Rejection over Kye, Blair and Tsuchiko

Claims 51 and 62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kye, Blair and Tsuchiko. Claim 51 has been canceled in this response and therefore the rejection of this claim is now moot. Independent claim 62 has, *inter alia*, features generally analogous to the features of claim 22. Accordingly, claim 62 is patentable over the combination of Kye and Blair for at least the reasons discussed above and for the additional features of this claim. Moreover, Tsuchiko was cited for disclosing a method of etching through a mask. Claim 62 has been amended in this response to remove the positioning a masking member claim feature. Therefore, the Section 103(a) rejection of claim 62 should be withdrawn.

F. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the pending claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are patentable over the applied art. The applicants accordingly request reconsideration of the application and a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a

telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned representative at (206) 359-6465.

Respectfully submitted,

Perkins Coie LLP

Date: 10/27/06



David T. Dutcher
Registration No. 51,638

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 25096
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000